DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 234 CE 042 647

AUTHOR Kenneke, Larry J.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Univ., Corvallis. Vocational-Technical Education Dept.
SPONS AGENCY Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem. Div. of Vocational Education.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 13p.; For related documents, see CE 042 648-652.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; *Curriculum Development; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Education Work Relationship; Material Development; *Occupational Clusters; Program Administration; *Program Improvement; Relevance (Education); Research Methodology; Research Problems; *School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; *State Curriculum Guides; Statewide Planning; Trade and Industrial Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Industry Review Panels; *Oregon

ABSTRACT

This project was conducted to develop and disseminate updated curriculum guides for nine selected cluster areas of vocational education programs in Oregon; only five were developed. The updates were based on recommendations made by industry review panels (IRPs). Specialists from the Oregon Department of Education and Oregon State University provided assistance to the panels. Updates were created for the industrial mechanics, metals, construction, food services, and forest products cluster areas. Where appropriate, mini-guides addressed the needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students, and efforts were made to reduce sex bias and sex-role stereotyping. Extensive efforts were made to revise the guides so as to improve teaching techniques or curriculum materials that are used in vocational classrooms and/or laboratories. The guides that were produced include information on (1) revision of program goals, (2) industry trends that will affect subject matter and teaching methods, (3) identification of changes in trade practices, (4) employment trends, (5) additions or deletions in subject matter and changes in emphasis, and (6) future equipment needs. Problems encountered during the project included lack of timeliness because of the busy schedules of the participants, which made scheduling of meetings and completion of materials difficult, and the resignation of the project director. However, the project concluded that IRPs are a viable method of updating curricula, and made recommendations for smoother functioning of future projects. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262234

ORF413309

FINAL REPORT

Industry Panel Curriculum Project

50-004-378

Submitted
to
Oregon Department of Education
Division of Vocational Education

by
Larry J. Kenneke
Acting Project Director
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
Oregon State University

CE042647

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

August, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. J. Case

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Project Identification	1
Background	1
Purpose	1
Goals and Objectives	2
Products	3
Design/Procedure	3
Number of Staff Involved	4
Accomplishments and Outcomes	5
Problems	5
Departures	5
Special Problems	6
Evaluation	6
Summary and Conclusion	6
Summary	6
Conclusion	6
Recommendations	7
Project Follow-up and Commitment	8
Budget/Spend-Out Report	9

Appendix B1
(Completed by Project
Director/Principal
Investigator

ABSTRACT

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Project Title: Industry Panel Curriculum Project

2. Principal Investigator and Organization: Michael J. Giblin - Larry J. Kenneke, Acting Principal Investigator
Address: Dept. of Vocational-Technical Education O.S.U.
Telephone: (503) 754-2733 - 754-2961
Congressional District

3. Special Population Target Groups
Check Primary Group(s)

Racial/Ethnic

American Indian or Alaskan Native	____	Limited English Proficiency	____
Asian or Pacific Islander	____	Handicapped	____
Black, Non-Hispanic	____	Disadvantaged	____
Hispanic	____	Displaced Homemaker	____
White, Non-Hispanic	____	Single Head of Household	____
Men	____	Part to Full-Time Employment	____
Women	____	Persons in Non-Traditional Vocations	____
		Others	____

4. Number of Students Affected ____; Number of Staff Affected 40

5. Project Objectives:

5.1 Modify nine cluster guides
5.2 Prepare and print nine (8-10 page) mini-guides

6. Project Procedures. (Describe the processes to be used in implementing and evaluating this project):
6.1 Identify and review nine clusters for review. (only 5 completed)
6.2 Organize and conduct industry review panel meetings.
6.3 Coordinate IRP work with OOIC work.
6.4 Prepare and print nine mini guide updates (8-10 pages each).

7. Project Products:

Nine (8-10 page) mini-guides (Five completed)

8. Expected Contribution or Potential Impact on Vocational Education:

Improved cluster instruction.

9. Will the product be placed in a classroom within your district in the five years?

X Yes ____No (In teacher preparation and inservice programs).

Project Identification

Project Title: Industry Panel Curriculum Project

Project Contract Number: 50-004-378

Institution: Department of Vocational and Technical Education
Oregon State University

Background

Fourteen occupational clusters were developed in the late 1960's. Cluster curriculum guides were written for each cluster and efforts were made to revise them on a six year cycle. Due to budget constraints, shifting personnel and realignment of priorities many guides have not been revised. Furthermore, a six year revision cycle was considered too long a time span in view of rapid changes in occupational skill requirements and employment trends. It was believed that minor revisions should be made more frequently through the use of cluster guide updates. These updates could contain recommendations made by industry review panels. The purpose of this project was to produce updated mini-guides.

Purpose The purpose of the industry panel curriculum project was to develop and disseminate cluster guide updates for nine selected cluster areas (only five were developed). The updates were based on recommendations made by industry review panels (IRP). Specialists from the Oregon Department of Education and Oregon State University provided assistance to the panels. The updates include recommendations on changes in program goals, industry trends, industry cluster area employment trends, subject matter emphasis, equipment needs and other related data.

Goals and Objectives The interim objectives and major goals of the industry panel cluster review project include:

1. Select nine of the fourteen cluster areas to be reviewed
    1.1 Develop criteria for determining cluster areas to be reviewed
    1.2 Consult Oregon Department of Education personnel on cluster review order
    1.3 Select cluster areas, develop timeline for completion
2. Organize industry review panels (IRP)
    2.1 Develop criteria for selecting IRP members
    2.2 Develop list of duties and expectations of IRP members
    2.3 Request input from appropriate sources to determine IRP membership
    2.4 Solicit IRP members
3. Organize and facilitate meetings of IRP
    3.1 Identify ODE and OSU staff to work with IRP
    3.2 Develop material which will enhance efficient use of panel members expertise in review of cluster guides
    3.3 Determine appropriate meeting time and location to insure maximum participation
    3.4 Convene sufficient meetings to accomplish stated objective
    3.5 Compile material and information provided by IRP
4. Coordinate IRP with the work of the Oregon Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (OOICC)

5. Write preliminary draft of cluster update

   5.1 Coordinate work of ODE specialist with IRP

   5.2 Send preliminary draft to IRP members

   5.3 Meet with IRP to make recommendations to ODE specialist on final revision of update

   5.4 Review of update by Oregon Department of Education personnel

6. Final writing and distribution of cluster guide update

   6.1 Coordinate writing of final draft of cluster guide update

   6.2 Print and distribute copies of update to appropriate Oregon vocational teachers and administrators

   6.3 Request time to present revisions at regional coordinator meeting

7. Write final report

Products Nine cluster guide updates of approximately seven to nine pages each were proposed. Five guides were actually produced. The guides were to include:

1. Revision of program goals
2. Industry trends that will effect subject matter and teaching methods
3. Identification of changes in trade practices
4. Employment trends
5. Additions or deletions in subject matter and changes in emphasis
6. Future equipment needs

Design/Procedures The design, procedure, and time-frame follow:

TIME FRAME

May 1-15, 1984 1. The project director (PD) and Oregon Department of Education (ODE) specialists identified clusters to be revised. Nine clusters were targeted.

May 1, 1984- Feb 1, 1985	2.	Then PD and ODE specialists selected IRP members and organized and scheduled meetings of the industrial review panels. Information for the guides was collected at these meetings and later through use of survey instruments.
Jul 1, 1984- May 30, 1985	3.	The PD coordinated efforts of IRP with ODE staff for purposes of writing cluster guide updates. The PD interpreted the information collection from IRP's and incorporated into the guides.
May 1, 1984- Jun 30, 1984	4.	The PD coordinated IRP work with OICC.
Jul 1, 1984- April 1, 1985	5.	The PD and ODE specialists reviewed preliminary drafts of updates and made recommendations for formatting of guides.
June 1, 1985	6.	The PD resigned his position at OSU. The department chair of Vocational and Technical Education at OSU assumed the role as Acting Project Director.
June 5, 1985	7.	The Acting PD contracted with a private consultant to complete the scope of work.
June 5, 1985- July 31, 1985	8.	The Consultant analyzed available data; gathered additional information and prepared five cluster guide updates.

Number of Staff Involved . Seven Oregon Department of Education staff were directly involved with the activities of this project. Eight Oregon State University faculty members from the Department of Vocational and Technical Education were affected by the project. Thirty-five industry/business people were involved with the project. The Industry Review Panels met in the Portland metropoliltan area, usually for a dinner work session. Follow-up data collection was conducted via telephone and mail surveys. An independent consultant provided closure to project activities.

Accomplishments and Outcomes

Camera-ready copy for five mini-guides was produced. The cluster areas addressed include; industrial mechanics, metals, construction, food services and forest products. Where appropriate, mini-guides addressed the needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students. Similarly, efforts were made to reduce sex bias and sex-role stereotyping. Extensive effort was made to revise the guides so as to improve teaching techniques or curriculum materials that are used in vocational classrooms and/or laboratories.

A second major outcome was achieved as a result of the project's processes and procedures. A methodology for gathering and validating information about cluster areas using members of industry was developed. The methodology was built upon the concept of industry review panels, i.e. bringing members of industry together in a formal setting to review a predetermined set of variables.

Problems

Departures . Project activities did not move along within the scheduled timeframe. Industry panel members were not identified and secured within the proposed timeframe. Similarly, individual IRP work sessions were not held within the planned period of time. Further, responses from IRP members were not received as planned. Numerous requests had to be made to get information from IRP participants. Taken in combination, these delays caused a serious problem in meeting established deadlines.

Special Problems . The industry review panel (IRP) concept posed some very real logistical problems. The individuals comprising each panel were extremely busy people. The PD has difficulty finding times at which everyone could meet. The IRP member's busy schedule also limited their ability to respond to informational surveys in a timely manner. The project director too, had a difficult time assimilating the vast array of information confronting him. In early June, the PD resiged his position at the University. The Department Chair of Vocational and Technical Education at OSU assumed the role of acting project director. He secured the services of a private consultant who completed five mini-guides.

Evaluation

The services of a third-party evaluator were not specified within the project proposal.

Summary and Conclusions

Summary . The purpose of this project was to produce updated mini-cluster guides. The methodology used to develop these guides was one of industry review panels. Panels composed of persons from industry were used to review selected clusters and make recommendations for their revision. Project staff analyzed IRP recommendations and produced mini-guides.

Conclusions . The following conclusions were derived from review of project activities.

1. Industry Review Panels (IRP) are a viable means of data collection.

2. When an IRP is used, its purpose, activities and deadlines must be clearly defined.

3. Use of an IRP requires continuous follow-up activity to ensure timely and accurate responses to information requests.

4. Scheduling of an IRP requires perserverance in order to resolve meeting time conflicts.

5. IRP members should be identified with a predetermined selection criteria clearly in mind.

Recommendations

1. Develop a detailed plan and work that plan.

2. Select IRP members using a predetermined selection criteria.

3. Develop a detailed agenda for each panel meeting.

4. Initiate a comprenesive follow-up effort to ensure appropriate feedback from IRP members.

5. Keep detailed and accurate records of each panel meeting. Use a recording secretary.

6. Select facilitators who possess a task orientation, yet possess human relations skills.

Project Follow-up and Commitment

1. Distributed through the Oregon regional coordinator network, the mini-guides will be used by teachers, counselors and administrators to improve vocational curriculum and teaching.

2. The mini-guides will be used in appropriately related vocational teacher preparation programs at Oregon State University.

3. The mini-guides will be used in appropriate vocational personnel inservice activities sponsored by the Oregon Alliance for Program Improvement.

4. Mini-guides will be used by appropriate curriculum development task forces throughout Oregon.

BUDGET

TITLE OF PROJECT Industry Panel Curriculum Project

	TOTAL COSTS	LOCAL COSTS	FEDERAL COSTS
A. 1000 Instruction			
100 Salaries			
200 Employee Benefits			
300 Travel			
Other Purchased Services . . .			
400 Supplies			
Instruction Subtotal			
B. 2210 Improvement of Instructional Services			
100 Salaries	12,407.00		12,407.00
200 Employee Benefits	2,617.77		2,617.77
300 Travel	960.38		960.38
Other Purchased Services . . .	254.50		254.50
400 Supplies	163.86		163.86
Improvement of Instructional Services Subtotal	16,403.51		16,403.51
C. 2220 Educational Media Services			
100 Salaries			
200 Employee Benefits			
300 Purchased Services			
400 Supplies			
Educational Media Services Subtotal			
D. 2500/2600 Support Services Business/ Central			
Indirect Cost @ 8 %	1,312.49		1,312.49
Support Service Business and Central Subtotal			
E. Other (include explanation)			
Other Subtotal			
COLUMN TOTAL	17,716.00		17,716.00